

PARTICIPANTS' COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS – collated comments and suggestions

Task 1: this version of the LLNP

Your table has two minutes to decide on the **best**, teaching, learning, community or provider OUTCOMES achieved through the current contract Language, Literacy & Numeracy Program (LLNP).

Community:

- The LLNP **opens** up pathways, facilitates for re-engagements with education, employment and **\*\*\*EMPOWERMENT\*\*\***
- A sense of belonging and the capacity in community and social capital.
- It's national, it's a pathway to training and employment.
- It's engaging, socially and educationally

Providers:

- Networking and engagement, making connections outside the organisation – expansion of service.


Teaching:

- Scope of practice expanded for many teachers.
- It includes literacy, not just language

Learning/ For Learners

- It's free and accessible (not accessible enough).
- 'free' education
- For jobseekers, it's the beginning of a pathway to further studies and employment.
- Introduction to structure
- Self-confidence and motivation – as a result of LLN skills gained
- Access to learning pathways, outcomes are expected
- Students can see a glimmer of hope to career pathways.
- Students are actively engaged in a literacy environment.
- The program's objectives are about employment

Task 2 – say what you think about the future format of LLNP.

<p><b>BLUE SKY – your best idea</b></p>	<p>How can LLNP services provide better teaching and learning opportunities? What are the best ideas for the future delivery of the program?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holistic services, LLNP and:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Housing</li> <li>○ Nutrition</li> <li>○ Social/Emotional Wellbeing</li> <li>○ Health Education = Healthy Human Being</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Re-branding, <b>please</b>: “literacy” “numeracy”</li> <li>• More trust, less reporting and heavy admin</li> <li>• Use the pre-level 1 ACSF!</li> <li>• Funding model based on meeting learners needs, please. Not on completing arbitrary blocks of hours</li> <li>• Use of Technology by providers should be incentivised.</li> <li>• Allow for flexibility and cultural appropriateness</li> <li>• RE-framing achievement- ie reward milestones pre-400 hours. ( Rethink certification)</li> <li>• Less administration.</li> <li>• Pathway planners – bridging and future plans- for learners, from LLNP into TAFE</li> <li>• Make it non-accredited – to build up learners’ confidence</li> <li>• A similar model to the AMEP would work better, with curriculum only (not 2 frameworks, curriculum <b>and</b> ACSF) and NO BLOCKS. – one framework, ONE LOVE</li> <li>• Make it about the learner and the learning and less about compliance.</li> </ul>
<p><b>For LEARNERS</b></p>	<p>What provisions should be made to be inclusive?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow any adult wishing to improve their skills into the LLNP, not just jobseekers/PRW             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Including funding for employed adults to receive training and night classes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Show cultural awareness in the development of the next guidelines.</li> <li>• Flexibility. Engaging. Hands on. Relevant Skills and experiences ( not just LLN)</li> <li>• New ways to engage in learning that are dynamic, innovative (NOT ‘old school’, recycled). Not just classroom.</li> <li>• Small class sizes- crowdedness is an issues – more physical space is needed, for learners returning to study</li> <li>• Informal settings and requirements.</li> <li>• Individual programming, tailoring, especially pre Level 1. For learners with very limited experience of learning, 1-1.</li> <li>• Use the pre-level 1 descriptors.</li> <li>• Flexibility for parents (ie school holidays)</li> <li>• Reduce reporting requirements             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reduce the number of outcomes required in a block</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Allow for the ability to move across a level, within a block- not ‘up’ a level, but from entry to exit</li> <li>• It connects disengaged people – provides a social and learning environment. Next time, open it up to wider enrolments, broader criteria eg women returning to study, or enrolling for the first time.</li> <li>• Make the free course open to all those who want to study LLN</li> </ul>
<p><b>For PRACTITIONERS</b></p>  <p>We feel like this!</p>	<p>How can we ensure that staff teaching, or working in the program are able to deliver quality programs? What will reduce churn? What will reduce stress?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flexibility of delivery and less reporting.</li> <li>• Real skills and easier access to project funds.</li> <li>• Providers need good referrals, i.e. people who are keen.</li> <li>• Good planning, tools and support accessible Technology</li> <li>• Training and Up-skilling for all provider staff.</li> <li>• State/National networks, systems and support.</li> <li>• Accommodation support and provision, in remote locations – otherwise ,providers can’t get staff into the program.</li> <li>• Qualifications, knowledge and skills</li> <li>• Resources and support –computers. Central support e.g. for identifying websites.</li> <li>• Systems for exchanging useful information, networking, people and technology.</li> <li>• Organise national PD for teachers, not just about ACSF, but about teaching practices</li> <li>• Fewer file monitoring, site infrastructure, verification requirements – there is TOO MUCH COMPLIANCE</li> <li>• Trust practitioners’ professional judgement – less reporting for verification.</li> <li>• Abolish conditions which are not there in other LLN programs (like ESL programs).</li> <li>• Let’s have fewer assessments – there are too many assessments</li> <li>• More community engagement, eg taking learners out to workplaces would make an open, flexible program.</li> </ul>
<p><b>For PROVIDERS</b></p>	<p>What parts of the contract should be altered, so that providers re-apply?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater flexibility, particularly in relation to remote settings.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Admin (makes us feel) ! Trust us, we’re the professionals!</li> <li>• The qualifications in the Guidelines are very restrictive...some fantastic LLN teachers don’t have a degree.</li> <li>• Reporting requirements are too onerous, are we reporting ACSF or curriculum outcomes.</li> <li>• 200 hour blocks – no blocks, please.</li> <li>• Attendance flexibility for parents.</li> <li>• Work Experience approval scrapped</li> <li>• ‘Capacity to benefit’ is too stringent</li> <li>• Longer blocks</li> <li>• Fix VET Online – edit the note facilities, so we can see more than 300 client records.</li> <li>• Make KPI’s more realistic ( especially about data entry!!) and:</li> <li>• Use the data to look at the benefits of the LLNP, e.g. how many learners have gained a level.</li> <li>• Constant staffing issues – staff turnover is a pain: a higher pay structure would make it more attractive, easier to staff than other (e.g., ESL) programs.</li> </ul>

ANYONE ELSE?	Referring agencies- who they refer and how they refer, and who they <u>don't</u> refer shows they don't always have much knowledge of LLN needs Actual employers and community group members as mentors, to encourage them at their to remain engaged, with immediate social groups